



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ATHENIAN INTERPOLATIONS IN HOMER

PART II. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

BY JOHN A. SCOTT

Cauer, *Grundfragen*², 145, says: "Die peisistratische Redaktion ist eine äusserlich wohlbezeugte, historisch durchaus verständliche, durch innere Gründe befestigte Tatsache." By this he means that the changing of the Homeric poems in the interest of Athens under the supervision of Peisistratus is a fact established by external probabilities, historical or traditional authority, and the evidence furnished by the poems themselves. In my former paper (*CP*, VI, 419 ff.) the internal evidences were examined and the conclusion reached that there was no proof in the text of the poems of any change in the interest or under the control of the Athenians. If the historical and external evidences show that Athens controlled or changed these poems, then the failure to bring them into harmony with Athenian pride or Athenian tradition is one of the most inexplicable things in literature.

The historical proofs have been examined by Mr. T. W. Allen with a thoroughness and a mastery which can be appreciated by no one who has not himself sought to cover the same field. His article, *Class. Quart.*, VII (1913), 33 ff. (without the discovery of new material in Egypt or elsewhere), seems to me conclusive. As his paper appeared since I published the first part of this study, I shall not, as was intended, discuss the historical or traditional aspects, but wish to be considered as quoting his entire treatment of this phase of the question as the reply to Cauer's statement that the recension of Peisistratus is a firmly established historical fact.

To the authorities named by Mr. Allen I wish to add the work of the Danish scholar, Nutzhorn, *Die Entstehungsweise der Homerischen Gedichte*, Leipzig, 1869. This book, written by a youth of twenty-eight years, is a marvel of sagacity and learning.

The Peisistratean myth seems to have originated in Megara, where political enmity tried to console itself by asserting that it had

lost by fraud what it could not hold by force, and this assumption, which was a balm for the wounded pride of Megara, did a like service for the scholars of Pergamon, who comforted themselves in the envy they felt for their more distinguished and fortunate rivals by assuming that the library at Alexandria and the work of Zenodotus and Aristarchus were but imitations of things long since accomplished by Peisistratus at Athens.

One thing ancient and modern admirers of Peisistratus have been unable to show, and that is any intellectual life which was called into being by him or his sons. It is true that Onomacritus was detected in forging a prophecy for these extremely superstitious despots, and Herodotus tells of their great belief and interest in signs, omens, and oracles, but neither he nor any early writer gives an indication that any efficient intellectual or literary impulse came from that family. The Peisistratidae and the family of Scopas in Thessaly might have the wealth to employ and the taste to appreciate the songs or praises of an Anacreon or a Simonides, but the literary barrenness of Athens during their lives and during the years immediately following gives no indication of any intellectual stimulus coming from them. The great library founded by Peisistratus and carried away by Xerxes was formerly an established fact, e.g., Christ, *Geschichte der gr. Lit.* ⁴, I, 67: "Das Exemplar des Peisistratos selbst ist im Laufe der Zeiten untergegangen; ob es mit der übrigen Bibliothek durch Xerxes weggeführt wurde lässt sich nichts Sicheres aufstellen." Strabo, a most competent authority, says (xiii. 54): "Aristotle left his own library to Theophrastus, being the first of those whom we know to collect books into a library." Aristotle himself, in the *Ath. Pol.* xvi, discusses the work done by Peisistratus, his criminal laws and the fact that he recognized therein extenuating circumstances, his efforts to assist poor farmers, and his democratic and philanthropic spirit, but makes no reference to his library or to his literary pursuits. If Peisistratus founded a library and made such enormous contributions to the literary and intellectual advancement of Athens as his admirers assume, it seems incredible that such a man as Aristotle should have been ignorant of that fact, or have passed it in silence. No writer, whose works are extant, connects Peisistratus with Homer until the time of Cicero, and no later writer

adds any details which prove a new source of knowledge; accordingly, the multiplication of the names of later writers referring to Peisistratus adds no strength to the argument. Professor Finsler is quite right in saying, *Homer*² (1913), 356: "Wolf deceived almost the entire learning of the last century by his bold exaggeration." Wolf's words are: "Historia loquitur. Nam vox totius antiquitatis et, si summam spectes, consentiens fama testatur, Pisistratum carmina Homeri primum consignasse litteris et in eum ordinem redegisse, quo nunc leguntur." To use "vox totius antiquitatis," when there is no allusion in Herodotus, Plato, Aristotle, or in any Athenian writer, no allusion in any of the numerous scholia referred to Zenodotus and Aristarchus, and not a hint until the time of Cicero, seems dangerously near intentional deception. Even more to the point is the fact that Herodotus says the Athenians used that passage in the Catalogue which is now most suspected, to explain their unwillingness to yield the command of the fleet to any but Sparta, and makes no comment. No one familiar with the method of Herodotus can suppose that he knew the Athenians were using a forged passage and yet concealed that knowledge. Again, when he identifies Onomacritus by saying that he was detected interpolating Musaeus, there can be no reasonable doubt that he would have added that formerly Peisistratus had intrusted him with collecting Homer and he had also added verses to the text. Aristotle (*Rhet.* i. 15) could hardly have known of the interpolations in the interest of Athens, since he names apparently with no suspicions B 558, which is the most condemned verse in the *Iliad*.

In the case of the charge emanating from Megara, that the arbitrators were tricked into basing their decision on an interpolated verse, one of two things is true, either Homer was well known at that time or he was not. If he was well known an interpolation would have been immediately detected, and if he was not well known he would not have been accepted as the ultimate authority. No later Spartan ever complains of this Athenian duplicity, and no Athenian is ever quoted as defending a proposed injustice by referring to this clever deception of the fathers.

The historical evidence for the recension of Peisistratus or of any other recension in the interest of Athens is so weak that Wilamowitz

was correct in saying (*HU*, 243): "Was Dieuchidas gab, die behauptung der attischen interpolation, war nichts anderes als seine vermuthung. Wir sind vollkommen in der lage die richtigkeit seiner conjectur zu prüfen." This is true not only of Dieuchides but of all later writers; they had nothing on which to build except the probabilities of such interpolations, and hence they carry no superior authority from the fact that they lived a few centuries after the supposed events. What are the probabilities that about 550 B.C. Homer came so completely under the control of the Athenians that in 480 Athenian legates at Syracuse could quote as genuine, before representatives of other Greek states, Athenian interpolations, and neither the speakers betray nor the hearers suspect that the quoted verses were spurious?

In order to compel this complete and rapid acceptance of their version the Athenians must have had at that time a commanding and unique position in politics and literature, and all Hellas must without questioning have regarded them as leaders. However, just the reverse is true, since for several years after 510 Athens was unable to settle her internal affairs without outside interference, and even as late as 480, ten years after Marathon, Athens accepted her own inferiority as an unquestioned fact and made no claim to the right to control either the land or the naval forces. Familiar as are the words of the Athenians in the presence of Gelo, they deserve quotation here (*Her.* vii. 161): "Now when your request was to have the whole command, we were content to keep silence; for well we knew that we might trust the Spartan envoy to make answer for us both. But since you have now put forward a request to have the command of the fleet, know that, even should the Spartan envoy consent to this, we will not consent. The command by sea, if the Lacedaemonians do not wish for it, belongs to us." When we consider the relative size of the Athenian and Spartan fleets, their modesty here and their yielding the command at Salamis might seem to us absurd in a people who had already had influence sufficient to compel the acceptance of a Homer changed in their favor. The relative slowness of Athens in coming to a position of leadership is shown by the fact that at the beginning of the sixth century there was a decree against discussing the acquisition of Salamis, while Aegina was a dangerous rival even

after the Persian war. There may have been something more than Persian ignorance or Persian arrogance in the question of Darius on learning of the burning of Sardis, and the similar question of Artaphernes on being offered an Athenian alliance after the expulsion by Cleomenes of seven hundred families from Attica. It could have hardly been due to political influence that an Athenian version of Homer came into universal use between the usurpation of Peisistratus and the gathering of the Greek legates at the court of Gelo.

It is hard to grasp how far Athens lay outside the currents of literature until the rise of the drama. The Muses were connected with Helicon, Olympia, and Pieria, but there was no mount of the Muses in Attica. Thamyris, Musaeus, Orpheus, and Linus were not connected with Athens. Eustathius 1466. 55 quotes from Demetrius of Phalerum a long list of fabled bards, naming the nativity of each, but the name of Attica is ignored. The assumed graves of Linus and other fabled poets found in various parts of Greece show the different poetic centers, yet Attica had no such grave to show. No one of the Homeric hymns originated there; the *Cypria* was assigned to Stasinus of Cyprus, the *Aethiopis* to Arctinus of Miletus, the *Ilias Parva* to Lesches of Mytilene—Thestorides of Phocaea, Cinaethon of Lacedaemon, and Diodorus of Erythrae were also named as authors of this poem—the *Iliupersis* was said to be the work of Arctinus, the *Nostoi*, of Agias of Troezen, and the *Telegonia*, of Eugammon of Cyrene. However the names of these authors may vary, the name of no Athenian appears among them. Proclus is the authority for the statement (*Oxford Homer*, Vol. V, p. 96) that early editors and commentators regarded Hesiod, Peisander, Panyasis, and Antimachus as the greatest epic poets after Homer. Here as in the former groups no Athenian appears. No one of the nine great lyric poets of Greece was a native of Attica, and Solon is the only elegiac poet living before 480 who has found a place in the Hiller-Crusius edition of the *Anthologia Lyrica*. Solon's eminence does not rest on literary foundations.

What other district adjacent to the Aegean was so destitute of literary fame as Attica before the prime of Phrynichus? If poetry was to be recited at the Panathenaic festival the Athenians were obliged to adopt the works of a foreign poet who sang the praises of

rival nations, and if the words of a living poet were desired at Athens it was necessary to send abroad for a Simonides or an Anacreon. We are on safe ground if we say that Athens' literary and political position at the end of the sixth century was not likely to assure the immediate adoption of interested interpolations in Homer.

There still remains the question of Athens' part in the history of the study and preservation of the Homeric poems themselves.

In what follows I shall omit naming the authority for an assertion when it is founded on the evidence given by such scholars as Christ, Sengebusch, Rothe, Finsler, and Allen, since a knowledge of the accepted facts is familiar to anyone who is likely to read this article. The earliest Homeric traditions seem to have clustered about and to have been guarded by the Homeridae, who were especially connected with Chios. Schools of Homeric enthusiasts flourished before the sixth century in Chios, Colophon, Thasos, Miletus, Phocaea, Lampsacus, and other neighboring regions. From these centers a knowledge of Homer early spread throughout all the Greek people. Cynaethus of Chios is said to have carried Homer from his native land into Sicily; Lycurgus is said, on the good evidence of Heraclides and Ephorus, as well as of Aelian and Plutarch, to have carried the poetry of Homer from Samos to Sparta; Abdera was peopled with settlers from Teos, and Xenophanes left Colophon for southern Italy, while Pythagoras left Samos to live in Croton.

About this time, the end of the sixth century, critical or exegetical study was made of Homer in many parts of Greece; Theagenes of Rhegium, a contemporary of Cambyses, and therefore of the Peisistratidae, has the honor of being the first to pursue Homeric investigations (Schol. B. to *Iliad* xx. 67). A list of those made famous by their Homeric studies is given by Tatian *Adv. Graecos* xxxi: *περὶ γὰρ τῆς Ὀμήρου ποιήσεως γένους τε αὐτοῦ καὶ χρόνου, καθ' ὃν ἤκμασεν, προηρένησαν πρεσβύτατοι μὲν Θεαγένης τε ὁ Πηγίγινος κατὰ Καμβύσην γεγωνῶς Στησίμβροτός τε ὁ Θάσιος καὶ Ἀντίμαχος ὁ Κολοφώνιος Ἡρόδοτός τε ὁ Ἀλικαρνασσεὺς καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ Ὀλύνθιος, μετὰ δὲ ἐκείνους Ἐφορος ὁ Κυμαῖος.* It is to be noted that no Athenian appears in this list of famous Homeric investigators. Homeric poetry must have been known in all parts of the Greek world by the end of the sixth century, since it seems to be assumed as the

background or setting for nearly all the earliest poetry. The influence of Homer on Archilochus, Terpander, Alcman, Stesichorus, Simonides, and other early poets has too often been discussed to be repeated here. The exact condition has been definitely stated by an early and competent authority, Xenophanes of Colophon, born before the usurpation of Peisistratus, and therefore trained in Ionia in the version there current before any recension of Peisistratus was possible. He regarded the knowledge of Homer as universal (Frag. 18, Hiller-Crusius): *ἐξ ἀρχῆς καθ' Ὅμηρον, ἐπεὶ μεμαθήκασι πάντες*. The perfect of the verb shows that he regarded Homer as the basis of education and not something now learned for the first time. Of similar purport are the words of Hiero to this same Xenophanes: "You complain that you can with difficulty support two servants, yet Homer whom you revile though he is dead supports ten thousand" (Plutarch, quoted by Sengebusch, *Hom. Dis.*, I, 131). Even though this may never have been said by Hiero, it gives some indication of the enormous number supposed to be interested in the preservation and conservation of Homeric poetry. Even Xerxes is said to have tarried on his march to do reverence to the gods of Ilium, a striking proof of the conception of Homeric extension and influence in the time of Herodotus (Her. vii. 42). Homer was regarded as something more than a poet, since Herodotus (ii. 53) assigns to him and Hesiod the formation of Greek theology.

The entire Greek world at this time, the end of the sixth century, regarded Homer as its teacher and prophet. Was that world likely to exchange the Homer it knew for a new and interpolated Homer? The Greeks were always a conservative people, tenacious of old customs and old institutions, so that epic poetry continued to be written in the Homeric dialect; Tyrtaeus could compose his anapests in the native dialect of Sparta, but his elegiac dactyls must show their Ionic origin; and even an Athenian poet when composing for an Athenian audience must give a foreign color to his choral lyrics, since they must show their foreign origin; the persistent conservatism of the Athenians, despite the ruin and fire brought by the Persians, repeatedly hampered Pericles' plans for beautifying the Acropolis. This conservatism still survives, and modern Athens has seen many bitter struggles because of it. In November, 1901, the publication of

a revised text of the Bible led to a bloody riot in which eight persons were slain, the ministry overthrown, and the Metropolitan forced to flee. In 1903 a similar, but bloodless, riot followed an attempt to produce in the theater a play of Aeschylus partially adapted to the popular speech.¹ In view of this Hellenic trait it seems incredible that Homeric bards and scholars should have thrown over the Homer they had known from infancy and have accepted without a murmur the interpolations of a state so obscure intellectually and politically as Athens was at the end of the sixth century. No trace of any such struggle has survived.

Improbable as the theory is in the light of the sixth century, the history of the Homeric poems in the next century makes it impossible.

There are no traces of any close connection between Athens and Homer during the sixth century, except the recitation of his poems at the Panathenaic festival. Athens had no part and claimed no part in the history of the Homeric poems during the fifth century; Aeschylus, Plato, and the orators might acknowledge their own and their countrymen's obligations to him, but no one of them, even when praising Athens the most, ever laid any claim to his interpretation or preservation.

The center of Homeric influence remained in Ionia in the fifth century, just as it had been in Ionia in the sixth. Xenophanes from Colophon, Pythagoras from Samos, and their schools kept up the Homeric spirit or criticism in Italy; Stesander from Samos was the first to sing at Delphi the battles of Homer (Athen. 638a). Cynaethus is said to have gone from Chios to teach Homer in Sicily in the last Olympiad of the sixth century. From the Ionic colony of Abdera came Democritus, who wrote a work on Homeric diction and vocabulary, as well as Protagoras, whose criticism of the use of the imperative in the opening of the *Iliad* is well known, and Hecataeus, not the logographer, who according to Suidas wrote a work in which he compared the poetry of Homer and Hesiod. It is interesting to note how the love for Homer perpetuated itself in this Ionic colony. The case of Abdera was typical.

Early in the fifth century it was a popular thing to criticize the teachings of Homer, as is shown in the case of Xenophanes, Pythag-

¹See Drerup, "Das Ende des Sprachkampfes," *DLZ*, April 15, 1911.

oras, and Heraclitus, all Ionians. Later an attempt was made to defend Homer from the charge of impiety by showing that he intended to write an allegory of nature; this attempt is associated with the names of Anaxagoras of Clazomenae, Metrodorus of Lampsacus, and Stesimbrotos of Thasos. No Athenian is in this group.

The knowledge of Homer in an age before a reading public was possible must have largely been carried from place to place by reciters or rhapsodes, and if an Athenian version of the sixth century was to take the place of an earlier version it must have been carried to popular favor by rhapsodes from Athens. There seem to have been few or no such Athenian rhapsodes. The classical description of these wandering Homeric evangelists is given by Plato in the *Ion*, and we find that even in Athens this reciter is from Ephesus, and those especially praised for their appreciation and interpretation of Homer are Metrodorus of Lampsacus, Stesimbrotos from Thasos, and Glaucon, who seems to have been from Rhegium. Ion has just come from a contest at Epidaurus; he disclaims the ability to recite any other poet than Homer, and to Homer he has devoted his life with passionate enthusiasm. This theory, which to Causer seems so reasonable, demands that this Ionian bard should come to Athens, exchange his old Homer for the new, and yet take it so naturally that neither he nor Socrates ever mentioned the matter.

The only reason for the fact that no reliable writer ever refers to an Athenian when naming those who made themselves famous in connection with the poetry of Homer is found in the assumption that Athens lay outside of the current of Homeric poetry and that she had no part in the creation, preservation, or transmission of Homer. It follows from the above that Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and Aristarchus never refer to Peisistratus in connection with Homer, and also that they make no mention of an Athenian manuscript of Homer. The case of Abdera shows how the study of Homer perpetuated itself from generation to generation, and, reversely, the absence of such study from Athens explains why no one of the great Homeric editors of Alexander or Pergamon was an Athenian. Zenodotus was from Ephesus, Aristophanes from Byzantium, and Aristarchus from Samian Samo-Thrace, while, in the rival school of Pergamon, Crates was from Mallus in Cilicia, Zenodotus was also from Mallus, and

Demetrius Ixion was from Mysia. If Athens were indeed the center and fount of Homeric poetry (and Professor Murray in his *Rise of the Greek Epic*, 295 ff., heads his pages with the words "The Gift of Athens"), it is most strange that no one of those who rose to eminence because of investigations in Homer should have been bred and reared in the atmosphere in which Homer was produced. Not only were none of the great Homeric scholars of Alexandria from Athens, but they never refer to an Athenian manuscript of Homer. Seven state manuscripts are mentioned as used by the Alexandrians, *Αἰολική*, *Ἀργολική*, *Κρητική*, *Κυπρία*, *Μασσαλιωτική*, *Σινωπική*, *Χία*. An edition by Antimachus of Colophon is frequently quoted. Of the state manuscripts those most quoted are, in the order of the frequency with which they are quoted by name, *ἡ Μασσαλιωτική*, *ἡ Χία*, *ἡ Ἀργολική*, *ἡ Σινωπική*. The Argives, because of their prominence in the *Iliad*, would be certain to preserve with great fidelity the text of the poem. Chios as the home of the Homeridae and a strong claimant for the birthplace of the poet would be most tenacious of early traditions and would also be certain to preserve an early text of the poems. The reason for the interest in Homer at Sinope is more hidden. Sinope was early the home of settlers from Miletus, and when Sinope was almost abandoned it was again peopled by new arrivals from that same Ionian Miletus. The second founding of Miletus was a little before the last quarter of the seventh century (cf. Robinson, "Ancient Sinope," *AJP*, XXVII, 148 ff.). Miletus in that century was a leading center of Homeric and epic influence, the home of Arctinus, who was the assumed author of the *Iliupersis* and the *Aethiopis*, also the home of the poet Melisander, who on the basis of *Iliad* i. 268 and *Odyssey* xxi. 295 wrote a poem on the battles of the Centaurs and the Lapithae. Sengebusch, *Introduction to the Odyssey*, 55, says: "Miletum, caput totius Ioniae, insignem Homericae poeseos fuisse sedem," etc. It seems most reasonable to suppose that the love for Homer which is shown by the very existence of this Homeric manuscript goes directly back to the mother city, Miletus. Sinope, though far-removed, was not outside the currents of Greek influence.

The manuscript most quoted was from Marseilles, *ἡ Μασσαλιωτική*. The story of the founding of that city by Ionians who left their

native Phocaea in the sixth century rather than submit to the yoke of Persia is too familiar to repeat here. Phocaea like Miletus was a great and important center of Homeric learning and Homeric traditions. Homer is said to have lived in Phocaea with Thestorides, to whom he gave some of his poetry in return for food and support (*Vita Her.* xvi). It was from this Homeric center, so full of traditions, that the exiles started who founded in the far west the colony of Massilia. They were no more likely to find themselves bereft of their favorite poet in their new home than the Pilgrims of the Mayflower were likely to find they had no Bible. Their fellow-Phocaeans who settled in adjacent Corsica were soon destroyed by the combined Tyrrhenian and Carthaginian forces, while those who found their way to the coasts of Spain returned to Ionia to carry on the unequal struggle against the Persians (*Her.* i. 162 ff.). Massilia was thus separated from Greece and Greek influences not only by enormous distances but also by hostile and alien nations. It may be possible to account for a Homeric manuscript in Sinope by the influence of the Athenian settlers who came to Sinope in the second half of the fifth century, but how account for an Athenian Homer in Massilia? The number of Athenians who found their way to that distant region must have been very small, and Homer was not the poet whom that small number would have brought. It was the knowledge of Euripides that rescued the Athenian prisoners from confinement in Syracuse (*Plut. Nicias* xxix), and it was the poetry of Euripides which saved the city of Athens from destruction at the hands of Lysander (*Plut. Lysander* xv), and the people of Caunus opened their harbor to an Athenian ship pursued by pirates in order that they might hear them repeat the verses of this same Euripides (*Nicias* xxix). Now Caunus was neighbor to those regions which sent forces to the Trojan war and should have been eager to hear the verses of Homer, if Homer were indeed "The Gift of Athens." This is confusing, but it is even harder to understand why a Spartan spared Athens for the sake of Euripides, a bitter foe of Sparta, and ignored her greater service in giving Homer to the world, a poet who gave eternal glory to Sparta. It is also confusing to remember that, while the Athenians might recite Euripides abroad, Ionian bards recited Homer in the streets of Athens.

It is hard to believe that Athenian influences carried Homer to Marseilles, or had power enough to induce its citizens to substitute an Athenian version for the Homer their fathers brought from Ionia in the sixth century. Every rule of logic compels the conclusion that here we have the Homer current in Ionia before the middle of the sixth century. Abdera with its enthusiasm for Homer was peopled from Teos about 550, Sinope somewhat earlier from Miletus. The Aeolic manuscript, no doubt, preserved the traditions used by Terpander in the seventh century, and Terpander was of Ionian ancestry, as well as a neighbor to Ionia; the Argolic manuscript may represent the Homer recited in Sicyon early in the sixth century whose praises of the Argives so aroused the envy of the tyrant, Cleisthenes (Her. v. 67). Xenophanes left Colophon, Pythagoras left Samos, and Cynaethus left Chios in that same century. All the lines of Homeric diffusion and study converge in Ionia; the latest possible limit for this diffusion is fixed by the capture of Phocaea, which closely fits the Teian settlement of Abdera. However, the settlement of Sinope, the time of Terpander, and the general knowledge of Homer as shown by the writings of Xenophanes, and the poetry of Archilochus and Aleman argue for an earlier date, hence the end of the eighth century is the latest probable date for the expansion of Homeric knowledge from its center in Ionia. No other place and no later date can satisfy all the divergent conditions. This explains the silence of the Alexandrian editors in regard to Athenian manuscripts of Homer; for there must have been a good text of Homer current in Athens, as is shown by the quotations in Plato. The Alexandrians in their disregard for this Athenian text of Homer followed the two main principles of the best textual criticism, as these principles are given by Birt, *Kritik und Hermeneutik*, 16:

Erster Grundsatz: Ist eine Handschrift aus einer andern, die wir noch haben, kopiert, so ist nur diese zu benutzen; denn was jene etwa Eigentümliches darbietet, kann nur auf Willkür und Konjektur beruhen.

Zweiter Grundsatz: Man bevorzuge die älteren Hss. vor den jüngeren. Es wäre ein Unsinn Vergil nach Hss. des 9-12 Jahrhunderts zu drucken, da wir die des 5. besitzen.

It was thus in strict accord with the best modern ideals that the Alexandrians ignored the later Athenian versions and manuscripts

and followed the older Homer as preserved in such widely scattered regions as Chios, Argos, Sinope, and Massilia. The assumption is calmly made by the adherents of the Peisistratean recension that his work was so freely conceded and the Athenian version so fully established that no one would think of mentioning it: "Wenn unsere Scholien von der peisistratischen Redaktion schweigen, dies nur den Grund haben kann, weil sie davon als selbstverständlich, bei ihrer ganzen Kritik ausgingen" (Erhardt, *Entstehung der Hom. Gedichte*, p. cxiii). One thing is surely to be conceded, and that is that Athens must have possessed the manuscripts of the great Athenian dramatists; yet this is not taken for granted but we are minutely informed of the means by which these manuscripts came into the possession of the Alexandrians. Why the remarkable reticence in regard to Homer?

CONCLUSIONS

At the end of the sixth century Homer was so well known to all Greeks that their conservatism would never have meekly permitted them to accept a new and altered version; moreover, all the streams of Homeric poetry flowed from Ionia, while Athens had no influence sufficient to change the current, until changes were impossible. No Athenian of the classical period ever claimed for his country any part in the transmission or shaping of Homeric poetry, and no Greek before the Christian era gives any praise to Athens for anything done in regard to improving or preserving the works of Homer. The mythology and traditions of these poems differ so widely in minute details from those current in Athens that they preclude the possibility of an Athenian version made to gratify Athens. The verse which is most confidently placed to the credit of Athenian interest is B 558, where it is said that Ajax took his stand next to the Athenians, while in its place the partisans of Megara quoted the presumed original in which Ajax is said to be allied with the men from Megara. When the Athenians enter battle in the fourth book of the *Iliad*, Odysseus is with their leader Mnestheus, Antiphus later hurls at Ajax and misses him, but strikes a companion of Odysseus (iv. 489). The fact that a shot directed at Ajax strikes a companion of

Odysseus, who has just entered with the Athenians, shows that Ajax was not with the Megarians, but with the Athenians. This hidden and subtle connection between Ajax and the Athenian proves that the verse urged as the original by the Megarians is spurious, and the assumed Athenian interpolation is no interpolation but a part of the original conception of the poem. I wish some defender of the Peisistratus theory would answer this argument, which is based on the evidence that a shot aimed at Ajax struck a companion of a man who was near the Athenians.

How did the tradition in regard to Peisistratus arise? Athens in common with other Greek states had public recitations of Homeric poetry, and somehow a regulation came into force forbidding the reciter to cull out the parts which would win him the greatest favor and commanding each reciter to follow the order of the poems; that is, a bard could not recite Z and then take up the emotional scenes of X. This must have become a necessary regulation, as the so-called *Certamen* between Hesiod and Homer shows. In this *Certamen* each reciter selected from any part of the poems those verses or scenes which seemed most likely to win approval.

That such a necessary provision in regard to the recitations at the Panathenaea was made seems certain, but who made it is a matter of dispute; the Platonic *Hipparchus* (228 B) assigns it to the son of Peisistratus, Hipparchus; while Diogenes Laertius (*Life of Solon*) assigns it to Solon. Neither of these would fit the purposes of Megarian patriotism, if Salamis was lost to them because of Peisistratus, and as Peisistratus was closely connected with the Panathenaea his influence there was so magnified that he was assumed to have such control over Homer as to give him power to change a verse at will; further, in accusing Peisistratus of tampering with the original they but charged him with repeating the very thing they had themselves done, for they had forged a verse to show a connection between Megara and Ajax. Their verse is a manifest imposture, since Δ 489, M 339, N 285, and O 334 show that Ajax was in closest touch with the Athenians. The charge of the Megarians that a single verse was decisive, and that, too, a forged verse, was not refuted, since Homer repeatedly answered it. Wolf with his

“vox totius antiquitatis” was a true Megarian and doubled the original imposture.

Athens had a private regulation in regard to the public recitation of Homeric poetry at the Panathenaic festival, but she lay outside the influences which created and preserved the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

June 9, 1914